

### III. REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 8, 12, 13 and 22 have been amended and claims 2-7, 9-11 and 14 have been canceled. As a result, claims 1, 8, 12, 13 and 22 remain pending in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Office.

Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 8 and 11-12 are 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0080032), hereafter “Smith,” in view of Horton *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,533,093), hereafter “Horton.” Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith and Horton and further in view of Morris *et al.* Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith and Horton and further in view of Edgar *et al.* Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith and Horton and further in view of Morrow *et al.* Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith and Horton and further in view of Park *et al.* Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith and Horton and further in view of Examiner’s

Official Notice. Claims 13-14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith and Horton and further in view of Morris *et al.*

With regard to the Office's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants assert that the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest a single, hand-held device having all of the functionality embodied with claims 1, 8, 12, 13 and 22, respectively. The Office uses six references and Official Notice in an attempt to deal with the majority of the features of the claimed invention. Applicants contend that the use of this many references makes the rejection untenable by, *inter alia*, destroying the Office's motivation to modify. Further, Applicants object to the use of Official Notice and request the Office provide references that teach these features. Still further, Applicants submit that even with the use of the six references plus the Official Notice, the Office still has not shown that the claimed invention teaches each and every feature of the claimed invention, including, but not limited to: a tool for use by a service technician to find and service an asset that is geographically dispersed from other assets and asset tracking software, installed on the portable computing device, for receiving an asset GPS location from the asset via the wireless interface, for directing the service technician to the asset, and for updating asset data, including the asset GPS location, via the wireless interface. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features.

Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



/

Hunter E. Webb

Reg. No.: 54,593

Date: May 30, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew